

REMARKS

Specification Amendments. The Applicant has amended the specification herein to correct a typographical error. No new matter was introduced by the amendment of the specification herein.

Claim Amendments. In the Non-Final Office Action, Examiner Raleigh rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,323,091 to *Morris* et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,570,328 B1 to *Steinmann*. The Applicant responds to this rejection as subsequently recited herein, and respectfully requests reconsideration and further examination of the present application.

Specifically, the Applicant has thoroughly considered Examiner Raleigh's remarks concerning the patentability of claims 1-5 over *Morris* in view of *Steinmann*. The Applicant has also thoroughly read *Morris* in view of *Steinmann*. Examiner Raleigh asserts and the Applicant respectfully agrees that *Morris* fails to teach or describe "characterized in that the foil is provided with at least one hole" as recited in independent claim 1, and "wherein the foil is provided with at least one hole" as recited in independent claim 4. Examiner Raleigh further asserts that *Steinmann* does teach the aforementioned limitations of independent claims 1 and 4 and thus it would have been obvious to apply the teachings of *Steinmann* to *Morris* to provide a metal strip with holes because this reduces high tensile forces between the strip and the glass during manufacture. While the Applicant arguably disagrees with the Examiner Raleigh on the obviousness application, the Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to recite "characterized in that the foil is provided with at least one hole having a sharp edge spaced from each wall of the cavity" and amended independent claim 4 to recite "wherein the foil is provided with at least one hole having a sharp edge spaced from each wall of the cavity" in view of the fact that *Steinman*, as best shown in FIGS. 2A and 2B, teaches a gauze 6 being embedded in the wall 2 of the lamp vessel 1 based on a fusion of quartz glass wall 2 through openings 11 established by wires 10 of gauze 6 in order to obtain a gastight seal. See, *Steinmann* at column 4, line 38 to

column 5, line 15. Thus, *Steinman* teaches away from wires 10 having sharp edges spaced from the wall 2 as required by amended independent claims 1 and 4. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Morris* in view of *Steinmann* is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claims 2 and 3 include all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claims 2 and 3 are allowable over *Morris* in view of *Steinmann* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 1 being allowable over *Morris* in view of *Steinmann*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Morris* in view of *Steinmann* is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 5 depends from independent claim 4. Therefore, dependent claim 5 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 4. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 5 is allowable over *Morris* in view of *Steinmann* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 4 being allowable over *Morris* in view of *Steinmann*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Morris* in view of *Steinmann* is therefore respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-5 as listed herein fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, Examiner Raleigh is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Dated: **December 13, 2007**

Respectfully submitted,
Hubertus Cornelis M.V.D. Nieuwenhuizen

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
& STANDARDS
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510

/Frank J. Keegan/

Frank J. Keegan
Registration No. 50,145
Attorney for Applicant

WOODARD, EMHARDT, MORIARITY,
MCNETT, AND HENRY, LLC.
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5137

Darrin Wesley Harris
Registration No. 40,636
Attorney for Applicant